

COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on March 15, 2011. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1, 3-6, 9-14 and 16-18 were pending. By way of response the Applicant has: 1) cancelled claims 1, 3-6, 9-14 and 16-18; and, 2) added new claims 21-28. As such claims 21-28 are now pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application and the allowance of claims 21-28.

The cancellation of the previously pending claims renders moot the basis for the Examiner's rejection. However, the Applicant offers the following comments concerning the newly presented claims and the cited references.

The Applicant's new claims are directed to each of the following concepts: i) a sensitive area is defined by a viewer of a video through a graphical user interface (See, Applicant's specification, Fig. 2 and para. [0013]); ii) the viewer of the video further defines different sensitive area priority levels for different areas of a frame (See, Applicant's specification, para. [0013]); and, iii) in response to network congestion, a sensitive area marked as having a priority level less than the highest priority has its bit rate reduced to that of the second part of the frame (See Applicant's specification, para. [0016]).

Each of i), ii) and iii) above correspond to the inventive concept that a user defines multiple priority levels for different areas of a frame identified by the user, and, moreover, that in response to network congestion, a sensitive area that has a priority level less than the highest prioritized area of frame can have its bit rate reduced to that of a (second) frame part other than that the (first) frame part that was defined by the user as having sensitive information.

Kuhn and Vetro do not appear to be capable of disclosing this feature. Neither Kuhn nor Vetro teach that areas of interest are determined by a user. Rather, the areas of interest are determined automatically by way of various signal processing techniques. As such, neither of these references are additionally capable of disclosing multiple priority levels for different areas of sensitivity defined by a user. Lastly, the ability to drop the bit rate of a region having a priority level less than the highest priority level to that of an area other than an area having been defined as having sensitive information, in response to network congestion, does not appear to be disclosed.

As such the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now presented are allowable and respectfully request the allowance of same.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: /08-15-2011/

/Robert B. O'Rourke/

Robert B. O'Rourke

Reg. No. 46,972

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408)720-8300